



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Eel

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/655,952	09/05/2003	Teck-Gyu Kang	TESSERA 3.0-320	8891
38091	7590	06/14/2005	EXAMINER	
LERNER DAVID, LITENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			CLARK, SHEILA V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/655,952

Applicant(s)

KANG ET AL.

Examiner

S. V. Clark

Art Unit

2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 26-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 9-12 and 15-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8, 13 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/03, 12/03, 5/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 9-12, 15-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamei et al.

Kamei et al teaches in form example figures 2 and 4 teaches forming a continuous sheet 2 including a core panel shown at 6 and at least two side panels 61, 64, 63, 62 which can be folded that are shown connected to the core panel along its edges. The assembly folded forming a stack with the core panel is shown in figure 1 and 3. Micro electronic elements 3, 30, 5, 4 connected to terminals are shown mounted on at least two of the panels and wiring areas 11, 12 and 13 including traces are also shown.

Since the panels of Kamei are disclosed as being capable of being folded said panels are obviously deemed to have fold portions that would facilitate folding.

Figures 1 and 3 show the core panel disposed at the bottom of the stack and terminal 7 are shown disposed on the core panel and exposed for connection to an external circuit. The traces on the panels look to be configured the same in figure 2 and are therefore deemed to be equal in length.

Col. 2, line 37 teach that said devices may be related to logic and memory devices which would obviously include memory and processor chips. As Kamei et al teaches fail to limit said chips to particular types is it deemed that the teachings of

Kamei et al said chips obviously suggests that the chips of his device may be the same or different depending upon design constraints and optimization.

Figure 1 and 3 show that in the folded arrangement the core panel 6 is shown having a chips disposed thereon.

As Kamei et al teaches that said assembly may comprise logic devices and memory structure which is deemed to obviously suggest use of memory chips and processors it would have been further obvious to one having ordinary skill in this art to arrange the processor on the core panel and the memory chips thereon, since the processor supports the memory and therefore forms the base of the memory structures.

Claims 1-5, 9-12, 15- 25 are rejected.

Claims 6-8, 13, 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The election of claims 1-25 without traverse in the response filed 3-21-05 is acknowledged.

Chip assemblies having folded panels are listed in the attached PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to S. V. Clark at telephone number (571) 272-1725.


S. V. Clark
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2815

June 12, 2005